DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 141 038 RC 009 984

AUTHOR Polopolus, Leo; Emerson, Robert D.
TITLE Florida Agricultural Labor and Unemployment Insurance. Bulletin 767, January 1975.
INSTITUTION Florida Univ., Gainesville. Agricultural Experiment Station.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jan 75
NOTE 64p.; Some parts may be marginally legible due to small print of the original document

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Age; *Agricultural Laborers; Blacks; Caucasians; *Cost Effectiveness; Economic Factors; Employers; Ethnic Origins; Farm Labor; Insurance Programs; Labor Force; Marital Status; *Migrant Workers; Organization; *Program Costs; State Surveys; Tables (Data); *Unemployment Insurance; Wages; Workmans Compensation
IDENTIFIERS *Florida

ABSTRACT

During the fall and winter of 1970-71, 2,200 agricultural employers and 2,500 workers were surveyed in Florida to determine the cost of extending unemployment insurance to agriculture. Average payroll data per employer were obtained for farm and nonfarm agricultural employers by type of ownership, economic class, and type of farm. Workers were described by sex, age, education, marital status, ethnic origin, and migratory status. Some possible effects of an unemployment insurance program on the migration of workers were analyzed. The employers in the survey had an average gross payroll of $45,822 and an average of 65 workers. Only 83 employers were corporations with more than 10 stockholders. The largest group of employers (1,491) were operators of fruit and nut farms, representing a $76 million payroll. Large employers, i.e., corporations with 10 or more stockholders or those with sales of $40,000 or more, were less sensitive to changes in the coverage criteria than all employers taken together. Of the agricultural workers, 56% were black, 33% were white, 26% were migratory workers, and 60% had an 8th grade education or less. The average number of weeks worked by agricultural workers was 46, and average hired earnings were $3,674. Migrants, blacks, and women were somewhat more likely to be actual beneficiaries than their respective counterparts. The average weekly benefit amount for actual beneficiaries was $34.70 with an average duration of 9.6 weeks. (Author/NQ)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

Bulletin 767 January 1975

ED141038

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FLORIDA AGRICULTURAL LABOR AND UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Leo Polopolus and Robert D. Emerson

Agricultural Experiment Stations
Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences
University of Florida, Gainesville
J. W. Sites, Dean for Research

2

RC009984

FLORIDA AGRICULTURAL LABOR AND UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Leo Polopolus and Robert D. Emerson

Dr. Polopolus is Professor and Department Chairman and Dr. Emerson is an Assistant Professor in the Food and Resource Economics Department, University of Florida.

This public document was promulgated at an annual cost of $2507.36, or a cost of 63¢ per copy to disseminate a summary of a study undertaken to examine the impact of extending unemployment insurance to agricultural workers and to make available information on agricultural employers and workers in Florida.

DIGEST

Agricultural employers and workers were surveyed in Florida during the fall and winter of 1970-71 as a part of a 15-state cooperative project to determine the cost of extending unemployment insurance to agriculture. The number of employers and workers estimated on the basis of the Florida survey were 5,289 and 66,778, respectively.

The employers in the survey had an average gross payroll of $45,822 and an average of 65 workers. Only 83 of the employers were corporations with more than 10 stockholders. The largest group of employers--1,491—were operators of fruit and nut farms, representing a $76 million payroll.

Nearly all employers would be covered under a provision of one or more workers in at least 20 weeks or a quarterly payroll of $1500, while slightly more than half of the employers would be covered with a provision of four or more workers in 20 or more weeks or a quarterly payroll of at least $5000. As is to be expected, the number of large employers, such as corporations with 10 or more stockholders or those with sales of $40,000 or more, is less sensitive to changes in the coverage criteria than all employers taken together. Separating employers by type of farm indicates that nearly all employers are covered for each farm type with the provision of one or more workers in at least 20 weeks or a quarterly payroll of at least $1500. The vegetable, fruit and nut, dairy, and miscellaneous employers maintain the highest degree of coverage as the criterion becomes less inclusive.

The majority of agricultural workers in Florida, 56 per cent, were black, and 33 per cent were white. Agricultural workers typically had little formal education; 60 per cent had an eighth grade education or less. Migratory workers represented 26 per cent of the workers interviewed. Of those workers who were labor force participants during at least one week of the analysis year, 74 per cent were participants for the entire year. The average number of weeks worked by agricultural workers was 46, and average hired earnings were $3,674. Although nearly all workers met the monetary eligibility requirement for benefits under unemployment insurance, only 31 per cent of those had periods of compensable unemployment in which they could claim such benefits. Migrants, blacks, and women were somewhat more likely to be actual beneficiaries than their respective counterparts. The average weekly benefit amount for actual beneficiaries was $34.70 with an average duration of 9.5 weeks.

The cost of providing unemployment insurance benefits is approximately 3 per cent of the taxable payroll for agriculture. The average benefit cost rate for currently covered employers in Florida was 0.9 per cent in 1971. With the present maximum tax rate of 1.0 per cent for new employers for the first three years in the program, nonagricultural employers would be subsidizing agricultural employers. After this period, however, the average of 3 per cent is below the maximum tax rate of 4.5 per cent for "experienced" employers.

PREFACE

This report deals with possible effects of initiating unemployment insurance in Florida agriculture. In addition, a description of Florida agricultural employers and workers in the context of proposed unemployment insurance alternatives is given. For example, average payroll data per employer are presented for farm and nonfarm agricultural employers, by type of ownership, economic class, and type of farm. Florida agricultural workers are described in terms of migratory status, sex, age, education, and ethnic origin, among other categories. The report also has an analysis of some possible effects of an unemployment insurance program upon the migration of workers.

It is not the intention of either the individual researchers of the Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences of the University of Florida to support or oppose unemployment insurance legislation. Moreover, statements and interpretations in this report are the responsibility of the authors and are not meant to reflect the official position or policy of the U.S. Department of Labor, the Executive and Technical Committee of NE-58, nor the Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences of the University of Florida. It is hoped, however, that this document will serve a useful purpose in the legislative debates that lie ahead.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

— Thousands of employers and agricultural workers in Florida.
— University of Florida Farm Labor Survey staff (Galen C. Moses, Larry Reuss, Jim Giles, Ron Muraro, Stu Monplaisir, and Cindy Bass, plus other enumerators, field supervisors, clerical workers, and computer programmers).
— Executive and Technical Committee members of the Northeast Agricultural Experiment Stations (Regional Research Project NE-58).
— Dr. Ward W. Bauder and his staff at Cornell University for a special computer output dealing with Florida agricultural workers.
— Roger Rossi of the Unemployment Insurance Service, U.S. Department of Labor.
— Florida industry and labor representatives and the Florida Farm Labor Research Advisory Council.
— George Stubbs, John O'Hara, and Lee Ponder of the Florida Bureau of Unemployment Compensation.
— Florida Farm Labor Office.
— Florida Cooperative Extension Service.
— Ralph Eastwood, W. W. McPherson, and M. L. Upchurch for comments on an earlier draft of this report.

CONTENTS

	Page
DIGEST	ii
PREFACE	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vi
INTRODUCTION	1
Changing Structure of Florida Agriculture	1
The Role of Farm Labor in Florida Agriculture	3
Social Legislation and the Farm Worker	5
FLORIDA FARM LABOR SURVEY	6
Origin and Development of the Survey	6
Objectives of the Study	7
Methods and Procedures	7
CHARACTERISTICS OF FLORIDA AGRICULTURAL EMPLOYERS	8
Farm and Nonfarm Agricultural Employers	8
Type of Ownership	9
Economic Class of Farm	10
Type of Farm	10
Perquisites	11
CHARACTERISTICS OF FLORIDA AGRICULTURAL WORKERS	12
Demographic Characteristics	13
Age	13
Sex	13
Marital Status	14
Education	15
Migratory Status	15
Ethnic Groups	17
Economic Characteristics	19
Labor Force Participation	19
Perquisites Received	21
Labor Force Participation and Earnings	22
Summary	24
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE—IMPACT AND FEASIBILITY	24
The Unemployment Insurance System	24
Proposals for Extending Unemployment Insurance to Agriculture	26
Impact of Alternative Coverage Provisions Upon Florida Agricultural Employers	27
Farm and Nonfarm Employers	28
Type of Ownership	28
Economic Class of Farm	29
Type of Farm	29
Worker Protection and Benefits	38
Potential Beneficiaries	38
Actual Beneficiaries	39
Cost Rates	41
Limitations of the Analysis	42

POSSIBLE EFFECTS FROM THE IMPLEMENTATION OF AN UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE PROGRAM IN AGRICULTURE 43
Migration and Unemployment Insurance for Agricultural Workers 43
Impact of Extending Agricultural Coverage Upon the Present Florida U.I. System 49
Impact Upon Production Costs 50
Impact Upon Labor Usage 50
Impact Upon Mechanization 50
Interregional and Foreign Competition 51
Impact on Worker Compensation 52
GLOSSARY 53
REFERENCES 55

LIST OF TABLES

Table		*Page*
1	Indices of Florida agricultural production, 1950-1970 (base period, 1957-1959)	1
2	Florida cash farm receipts, five year average data, 1950-54 to 1965-69, annual 1971	2
3	Number of farms with sales of $2,500 or more reporting hired and contract agricultural labor in Florida, 1959, 1964, and 1969	4
4	Hired farm labor by type of farm, Florida, 1969	5
5	Farm and nonfarm employers of agricultural labor in Florida	9
6	Type of ownership of firms employing agricultural workers in Florida	10
7	Economic class of farms of agricultural employers in Florida	11
8	Type of farm of agricultural employers in Florida	11
9	Number of Florida agricultural employers providing perquisites and the number of workers receiving perquisites	12
10	Age and sex distribution of Florida agricultural workers	14
11	Marital status of farm workers, Florida	15
12	Educational level of workers, Florida	16
13	Migratory status of workers, Florida	16
14	Agricultural workers by ethnic group, Florida	17
15	Labor force participation, Florida	19
16	Perquisites received by farm workers, Florida	21
17	Labor force participation and earnings of farm workers, Florida	23
18	Effect of selected alternative coverage provisions upon farm and nonfarm agricultural employers in Florida	30
19	Type of ownership and selected alternative coverage provisions in Florida	32
20	Economic class of farm and selected alternative coverage provisions in Florida	33

21	Type of farm and selected alternative coverage provisions in Florida	34
22	Florida farm workers by employment status during analysis year	39
23	Earnings and employment of potential and nonbeneficiaries, by migratory status, Florida (full coverage)	40
24	Actual beneficiaries by selected characteristics, Florida (full coverage)	41
25	Earnings and employment of actual beneficiaries, Florida (full coverage)	42
26	Benefit cost rates and added cost rates for Florida agricultural work, present Florida employer coverage provision	42
27	Reduced migration and the added cost of unemployment insurance, Florida	47
28	Work reduction and income loss per person, Florida	48
29	Comparison of agricultural and present nonagricultural coverage in Florida, assuming 1 in 20 or $1500 employer coverage provision	49
30	Average payroll and estimated unemployment insurance taxes for new and experienced employers, by type of farm, Florida	51

INTRODUCTION

Changing Structure of Florida Agriculture

Florida agriculture is extremely diverse and is undergoing continued change over time. Both physical output and the cash value of farm receipts have increased dramatically in the past 20 years. Crop production in 1970 was 46 per cent above the 1957-59 level, while livestock production in 1970 was 70 per cent larger than the 1957-59 base period. Increases in physical output over the past two decades were particularly noteworthy for soybeans, sugarcane, and poultry (Table 1). While crop production still accounts for the larger share of total output, the livestock component is increasing at a somewhat faster rate.

The index of agricultural production increased approximately 50 per cent in the past decade; cash farm receipts increased roughly 60 per cent during the same period. Total cash farm receipts for crops and livestock increased by nearly 300 per cent over the past 20 years. The rate of increase in cash farm receipts for livestock and its products was more pronounced than the rate of increase of receipts from crops. This was similar to the index of volume of output. In 1971 cash receipts from crops exceeded $1 billion, compared with total receipts of $411 million from livestock (Table 2).

Table 1. Indices of Florida agricultural production, 1950-1970 (base period, 1957-1959).

Commodity	Year				
	1950	1955	1960	1965	1970
Total crop and livestock	72	104	105	125	153
Total crops	77	113	105	122	146
Citrus	70	102	102	99	155
Vegetables	88	133	108	139	112
Sugarcane	79	79	106	373	395
Tobacco	98	134	130	115	110
Peanuts	124	125	112	168	213
Soybeans	14	72	90	213	541
Total livestock	58	83	107	132	170
Meat animals	66	97	98	116	125
Whole milk	52	77	114	121	143
Poultry	50	68	111	187	308

Source: Adapted from [7].

Table 2. Florida cash farm receipts, five year average data, 1950-54 to 1965-69, annual 1971.

Commodity	Period									
	1950-54		1955-59		1960-64		1965-69		1971	
	million $	%	million $	%	million $	%	million $	%	million $	%
Total crops and livestock	526.3		692.9		876.6		1,135.6		1,421.9	
Total crops	401.9	76.3	514.5	74.3	661.7	75.5	819.8	72.2	1,011.1	71.1
Oranges	141.0	26.8	213.9	30.9	273.7	31.2	275.2	24.2	333.6	23.5
Grapefruit	37.0	7.0	40.6	5.9	49.5	5.6	65.3	5.8	106.8	7.5
Truck crops	126.2	24.0	146.8	21.2	169.7	19.4	238.0	21.0	275.0	19.3
Sugarcane	11.0	2.1	10.4	1.5	25.5	2.9	52.4	4.6	68.6	4.8
Tobacco	21.6	4.1	21.0	3.0	27.0	3.0	29.4	2.6	26.8	1.9
Soybeans	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	7.0	0.6	13.3	0.9
Other	65.1	12.4	81.8	11.8	116.3	13.3	152.5	13.4	187.0	13.2
Total livestock	124.8	23.7	178.4	25.7	214.9	24.5	315.8	27.8	410.8	28.9
Cattle & calves	35.3	6.7	56.2	8.1	67.3	7.7	110.4	9.7	163.9	11.5
Hogs	15.8	3.0	13.6	2.0	11.3	1.3	15.5	1.4	17.3	1.2
Eggs	15.6	3.0	23.6	3.4	37.7	4.3	60.8	5.4	56.4	4.0
Chickens and broilers	11.5	2.2	8.4	1.2	7.0	0.8	15.1	1.3	24.6	1.7
Dairy products	42.3	8.0	71.1	10.3	86.8	9.9	107.1	9.4	141.2	9.9
Others	4.3	0.8	5.5	0.8	4.8	0.5	6.9	0.6	7.4	0.5

Source: Adapted from [8], various issues.

The above trends in the index of output and in cash farm sales have some obvious implications for the hired agricultural work force, even if the question of unemployment insurance is set aside. The increase in livestock production (relative to crop production) suggests a gradual shift in the relative contribution of hired labor to the total value of agricultural production since livestock production is less labor intensive.

In accord with national trends, the number of Florida farms has declined in recent years. However, the number of farms with sales of $2,500 or more has increased from 17,735 in 1964 to 20,096 in 1969; this is an increase of 13.3 per cent between 1964 and 1969.[1] Although total farm acreage decreased 9.0 per cent between 1964 and 1969, acreage of farms with sales greater than $2,500 decreased only 2.6 per cent. Harvested cropland acreage, however, increased 1.4 per cent for all farms and 9.2 per cent for the commercial farms with sales in excess of $2,500.

Farms with sales of *less* than $2,500 accounted for a negligible percentage of Florida's total farm receipts—1.8 per cent in 1964 and 1.3 per cent in 1969. There were 4,050 Florida farms with sales of $40,000 or more; these farms represented 85 per cent of total sales in 1969, but only 21.5 per cent of the farms with sales in excess of $2,500. Farms with gross sales of $100,000 or more accounted for 10.5 per cent of farms with sales in excess of $2,500 and 73.3 per cent of total sales.

Individual and family farms represented almost 80 per cent of Florida farms with sales of $2,500 or more. Partnerships and corporations with 10 or fewer stockholders accounted for 20.2 per cent of the total number, while corporations with more than 10 stockholders represented less than one per cent of Florida's commercial farms.

The Role of Farm Labor in Florida Agriculture

There is considerable seasonality in the utilization of agricultural labor in Florida in terms of regions and certain commodities, such as mixed vegetables, sugarcane, and citrus [6, pp. 4-6].[2] Harvest mechanization has not yet appeared in sufficient magnitude to diminish the role of manual harvesting operations

[1] This and the following description of Florida's farms includes both employers and nonemployers of agricultural labor as estimated by the Census of Agriculture.

[2] Numbers in brackets refer to References.

for the more important crops of fresh market tomatoes, oranges, grapefruit, sugarcane, and tobacco, as well as some of the less important commodities such as strawberries. Also, it is believed that the increase in agricultural production over the past two decades has required increases in physical agricultural labor requirements, even though certain labor-saving technologies have been introduced throughout Florida agriculture.

According to the U.S. Census of Agriculture, farms with sales of at least $2,500 and employing farm workers numbered 12,618 in Florida during 1969. This represented a decrease from the 16,004 farms reporting hired workers in 1959 (Table 3). Of the 12,618 employers in 1969, 3,738 or 29.6 per cent were estimated to have expended less than $500 for agricultural labor for the entire year and another 3,743 farms expended between $500 and $2,499 for agricultural labor. Thus, 5,037 commercial farms were reported by the U.S. Census to have expenditures for agricultural labor in excess of $2,500 per farm. The general trend shows a reduction in the number of farms employing agricultural labor, along with a somewhat higher concentration of payroll among the farms of larger farm sales. Historical data are unavailable, but contract agricultural labor accounted for over one-third of estimated payroll in 1969.

Of the 12,618 "commercial" farms reporting hired farm labor in the 1969 Agricultural Census, fruit and nut farms

Table 3.—Number of farms with sales of $2,500 or more reporting hired and contract agricultural labor in Florida, 1959, 1964, and 1969.

Type of Agricultural Labor and Year	Number of Farms Reporting	Payroll
		million $
Contract labor		
1969	5,445	96.6
1964	n.a.	n.a.
1959	n.a.	n.a.
Hired labor		
1969	12,618	170.8
1964	13,158	151.9
1959	16,004	109.9

n.a. = not available

Source: [11, p. 4].

accounted for almost 30 per cent of the farm employers. It was determined by the Census that 10,423 laborers on fruit and nut farms worked for 150 or more days in 1969, while 28,072 workers were employed for less than 150 days (Table 4). Table 4 also provides the data for other farm types in Florida.

In the future Florida's agricultural labor force may be affected by harvest mechanization, biological and other mechanical innovations, urbanization, continued and gradual shift toward livestock and related products, the relative importance of the labor contractor, and possible state and federal legislation affecting employers and workers.

Table 4.—Hired farm labor by type of farm, Florida, 1969.

Type of Farm	Number of farms with sales of $2,500 or more	Number of workers			
		150 days or more	%	Less than 150 days	%
Total	12,618	42,804	100.0	120,941	100.0
Cash grain	427	605	1.4	2,124	1.8
Tobacco	780	1,548	3.7	16,288	13.5
Cotton	19	13	0.0	115	0.1
Other field crops	457	4,234	9.9	7,633	6.3
Vegetables	932	7,704	18.0	28,149	23.3
Fruit and nut	3,675	10,423	24.4	28,072	23.2
Poultry	656	1,838	4.3	4,150	3.4
Dairy	495	3,681	8.6	2,578	2.1
Other livestock	1,627	692	1.6	7,267	6.0
Livestock ranches	1,443	1,901	4.4	5,652	4.7
General	689	419	1.0	5,022	4.2
Miscellaneous	1,418	9,710	22.7	13,891	11.5

Source: [11, pp. 134-135].

Social Legislation and the Farm Worker

The general purpose of this report is to provide information and analysis of selected employer coverage criteria which might be considered in legislation covering unemployment insurance for agricultural workers. Social legislation has already been extended to eligible agricultural workers for social security and minimum wage benefits under federal statute and for workmen's compensation under Florida law. Other state and federal programs offer a wide variety of aid and services for the agricultural laborer and/or employer, e.g., Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, Florida Migrant Health Project in 13

counties, and the Labor Contractor's Registration Act. Unemployment insurance and collective bargaining, however, continue to be the major items without federal legislation pertaining to agricultural labor.

While unemployment insurance is a form of social legislation, it is not primarily a welfare or aid program based on an individual needs test. Unemployment insurance is designed as a wage related program to compensate eligible workers of covered employers for part of their earnings loss resulting from involuntary unemployment. Unemployment compensation benefits to workers are limited in both duration and amount and are based upon actual work history with covered employers. Benefit payments are also paid only for weeks of compensable unemployment. That is, an otherwise eligible unemployed worker must be willing, able, and seeking employment in order to qualify for unemployment compensation benefits.

FLORIDA FARM LABOR SURVEY

Origin and Development of the Survey

The Florida Farm Labor Survey was initiated in August of 1970 by the Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences of the University of Florida as an integral part of Regional Research Project NE-58 of the Northeast Agricultural Experiment Stations. The inclusion of Florida and Texas into the regional labor project was due primarily to the fact that Florida and Texas are large employers of agricultural labor and because the migratory nature of interstate workers often involved migration into and/or out of Florida and Texas.[3]

The Florida Farm Labor Survey involved two interrelated field surveys—one of agricultural employers and the other of agricultural workers. The principal objective of the survey work was to carefully examine the impact of introducing unemployment insurance to agriculture in Florida.[4]

[3] For a more detailed discussion of the origins of the survey, see [6, pp. 10-12].

[4] Since the added cost of extracting other economic and sociodemographic data from agricultural workers was minor relative to the necessary questions, the worker questionnaire, in particular, was expanded to yield additional descriptive data not having a direct bearing upon the question of unemployment insurance. Some of these socioeconomic data of Florida agricultural workers will be the source of future reports.

Objectives of the Study

The intent of this report is as follows:

1. Describe Florida agricultural employers by type of employer (farm and nonfarm), type of ownership, economic class of farm, type of farm, and perquisites supplied;
2. Describe Florida agricultural workers by selected characteristics, such as age, sex, marital status, educational level, migratory status, ethnic groups, labor force participation, perquisites received, and earnings;
3. Determine the impact of unemployment insurance upon agricultural employers as influenced by type of employer, type of ownership, economic class of farm, and type of farm;
4. Determine the impact of unemployment insurance on agricultural workers as influenced by selected factors, such as migratory status and ethnic groups;
5. Estimate cost rates for selected employer coverage provisions; and
6. Discuss possible effects of the implementation of an unemployment insurance program upon migration of workers, production costs, mechanization, interregional competition, labor usage, and worker compensation.

Methods and Procedures

The Florida Farm Labor Survey was conducted on a statewide basis, utilizing random sampling techniques designed to estimate populations of agricultural employees and workers. A stratified random sample of approximately 2,200 agricultural employers was surveyed via a mailed questionnaire in the Fall of 1970. The employer rate was 43 per cent overall, but considerably higher for the employers with larger numbers of employees. Personal interviews of over 2,500 randomly selected agricultural workers were conducted in the period November 1970 to February 1971. The worker sampling rate was related to the size of the sample employer's labor force. That is, all workers were interviewed on the sample farms with seven or fewer workers, while 10 per cent or at least two workers were interviewed on farms with more than seven agricultural workers. A special random sampling scheme was devised for selecting workers on multiple enterprise and/or multiple location farms [6, pp. 13-19].

As distinguished from the U.S. Census of Agriculture which attempts to count all Florida farms and employers of

farm labor, the Florida Farm Labor Survey was restricted to estimates of agricultural employers who employ agricultural workers *and* provide annual and/or quarterly reports regarding their hired workers to the U.S. Social Security Administration. Hence, the Florida Farm Labor Survey's estimates of the number of farm employers and workers are expected to be below the figure shown by the Census of Agriculture for the same period. On the other hand, the Farm Labor Survey was designed to insure a very high degree of reliability of the agricultural payroll in Florida. This was because of the study's emphasis upon estimating employers' contributions to the unemployment insurance fund. These contributions are in turn directly related to covered payroll. Hence, the Florida Farm Labor Survey provides reasonably accurate estimates of employers and workers who account for the bulk of the agricultural payroll. However, the Florida survey excludes and/or underestimates the relatively large number of small farm operators who employ only occasional farm workers.

Although the interview period of November through February is the peak demand for the major components of Florida agriculture such as citrus and vegetables, this is not the case for north Florida. However, this would result at most in an understatement of seasonal labor estimates for north Florida. For the purposes of studying the impact of unemployment insurance, this will have a minimal effect as long as the workers can be expected to be similar to those sampled in other parts of the state.

CHARACTERISTICS OF FLORIDA AGRICULTURAL EMPLOYERS

Farm and Nonfarm Agricultural Employers

While farm operators account for 88 per cent of the number of agricultural employers and 86 per cent of the aggregate agricultural payroll, labor contractors and other nonfarm agricultural employers hire and pay wages directly to 35 per cent of Florida's agricultural wage items.[5] The Florida Farm Labor Survey estimate of 5,289 employers (Table 5) compares favorably with the U.S. Census estimate of 5,037 commercial farms having an agricultural payroll in excess of $2,500 (page 6 of this report). The average annual payroll of a farm employer

[5] Wage item estimates may represent a duplicated count of workers, since a given worker may have been employed and reported by several employers.

Table 5.—Farm and nonfarm employers of agricultural labor in Florida.

Type of employer	Number of employers	Covered gross payroll	Average gross payroll per employer	Average number of wage items per emp.	Avg. nmbr. of seasonal wage items per emp.
		million $	$		
All employers	5,289	242.4	45,822	65	54
Farm employers	4,639	207.6	44,755	48	38
Labor contractors	457	24.2	52,900	227	209
Other nonfarm employers	193	10.6	54,707	78	66

was $44,755 or slightly below the average annual payroll of labor contractors and other nonfarm agricultural employers. The average labor force of a labor contractor was over four times larger than the average number of workers hired by farm employers. Seasonal workers (or workers who were employed for less than 150 days) represented a sizeable share of the hired labor force for all types of employers. For example, farm employers reported an average of 38 seasonal workers (wage items) out of an average of 48 workers in 1969 (Table 5), and labor contractors reported that 90 per cent of their wage items were seasonal in 1969.

Type of Ownership

Contrary to some popular opinions, employers of Florida's agricultural workers are primarily individual and family farms and/or small corporations. Less than 2 per cent of the agricultural employers in Florida are corporations with more than 10 stockholders. The 83 corporations with more than 10 stockholders (which include incorporated agricultural cooperatives) account for 17 per cent of the total agricultural payroll. There is a sharp contrast between the average payroll and average labor force for the individual-family farms and the large "agribusiness" corporations. As one would expect, corporations with more than 10 stockholders have approximately 10 times as many regular and seasonal workers with corresponding average payrolls more than 10 times as large as individual-family farms (Table 6).

Table 6.—Type of ownership of firms employing agricultural workers in Florida.

Type of ownership	Number of employers	Covered gross payroll	Average gross payroll per employer	Average number of wage items per emp.	Avg. nmbr. of seasonal wage items per emp.
		million $	$		
Individual, family, partnership, and corporations with 10 or fewer stockholders	5,194	201.2	38,735	57	48
Corporations with more than 10 stockholders	83	41.1	492,716	554	430

Economic Class of Farm

Farm employers with gross sales of $40,000 or more in 1969 accounted for 52 per cent of all farm employers and 91 per cent of total farm payroll. The average payroll for Class I farms was $78,429, compared with a payroll of $8,506 for the average of farms in Classes II, III, and IV. There was also a striking difference in the average number of wage items between Class I and the smaller farm (Table 7).

Type of Farm

Considerable variation in average payroll and the average regular and seasonal work force was exhibited over the 10 types of farms identified in Table 8. Average payroll per employer ranged from $101,082 for other field crops (which includes sugarcane farms)[6] to $12,594 for livestock farms. However, the average vegetable farm employed 135 wage items in 1969, of which 118 represented seasonal workers (Table 8).

Both Tables 7 and 8 present data for farms which pay their workers directly and thus these tables omit the payroll of labor contractors and other nonfarm employers. Since the bulk of the $34.8 million payroll of the various nonfarm em-

[6] Since foreign contract workers would not likely be eligible for unemployment insurance benefits, no estimates of worker numbers and payroll of foreign agricultural employees were included in the survey results.

Table 7.—Economic class of farms of agricultural employers in Florida.

Economic class of farms†	Number of employers	Covered gross payroll	Average gross payroll per employer	Average number of wage items per employer	Average number of seasonal wage items per emp.
		million $	$		
Class I	2,406	188.7	78,429	83	65
Classes II, III, and IV	2,222	18.9	8,506	11	9

†Economic class was based on the total value of sales of agricultural products reported for 1969.

Class I — $40,000 or more
Class II— $20,000 - 39,999
Class III — $10,000 - 19,999
Class IV — Less than $10,000 but more than $2,500

Table 8.—Type of farm of agricultural employers in Florida.

Type of farm	Number of employers	Covered gross payroll	Average gross payroll per employer	Average number of wage items per employer	Average number of seasonal wage items per employer
		million $	$		
Cash grain	69	4.3	62,265	56	26
Tobacco	220	6.5	29,572	60	54
Other field crops	241	24.4	101,082	57	33
Vegetables	293	27.3	93,141	135	118
Fruit and nut	1,491	76.2	51,098	71	59
Poultry	246	3.9	15,966	13	9
Dairy	271	13.6	50,411	25	12
Livestock	735	9.3	12,594	10	7
General	293	11.8	40,154	37	28
Miscellaneous	780	30.4	39,922	27	16

ployers is believed to be expended on fruit and vegetable farms, Table 8 underestimates the total payroll for these activities.

Perquisites

Housing is one of the major perquisites provided agricultural workers by agricultural employers. Approximately 8,468

Table 9.—Number of Florida agricultural employers providing perquisites and the number of workers receiving perquisites.†

Perquisite	Number of employers providing	Number of workers receiving	
		Regular workers††	Seasonal workers††
Housing	1,654	8,468	12,094
Meals	352	900	2,378
Bonus	11	463	68
Insurance	35	570	197
Sick leave	1	140	20
Paid vacation	36	246	20
Other	806	5,019	50,985

†Workers reported by employers. See Table 16 for similar data as reported by workers.

††The estimates of workers or wage items may represent a duplicated count of some individuals since a given worker may have been employed and reported by several employers.

regular workers and 12,094 seasonal workers were reported by employers as having received housing in 1969. A relatively small percentage of agricultural workers received meals, bonuses, insurance, sick leave, and paid vacations (Table 9).

CHARACTERISTICS OF FLORIDA AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

Extensive descriptive data were collected on Florida farm workers in addition to the data immediately needed to determine the cost of the extension of unemployment insurance coverage to agriculture. The population of farm workers as estimated at the time of interview during the period of November 1970 to February 1971 was 66,778. As a first comparison of this number, the 1970 Census of Population [10] reports 60,747 persons classified as "farm laborers and foremen" who were at least 16 years of age.

The material presented in this section is only a brief introduction to the available data which will be available in a later publication, but it summarizes some of the more important demographic information. This demographic information is an essential component of necessary data for the consideration of policies affecting agricultural labor. It is often useful to know the characteristics of workers in order to predict possible impacts of policies on particular segments of the labor force.

For example, one may be interested in how alternative criteria for inclusion in a particular program would affect the proportion of black workers included. Comparisons are also made with other segments of the population or the U.S. farm labor force when there are significant differences.

Demographic Characteristics

Age

Agricultural workers in Florida are rather evenly distributed over five-year age groups from age 16 through 60, as shown in Table 10. Roughly 10 per cent are included in each five-year group. This should be contrasted with the U.S. farm labor force, which is considerably more skewed to the younger age groups. Over half of the U.S. farm labor force, 55 per cent [9, p. 10], were under 25 years of age in comparison to 21 per cent of the Florida farm labor force.

Sex

The Florida farm labor force was composed of 70 per cent male workers and 30 per cent female (Table 10). The age distribution varies somewhat between the sexes with relatively fewer women in the 30-39 age group than for men. In comparison with the U.S. farm labor force, there were relatively more women in Florida, 30 per cent in comparison to 24 per cent in the U.S. [10, p. 10].

The 1970 Florida labor force was made up of 38 per cent female workers [10]. The 1970 Census of Population also indicates there were 18,302 female farm laborers and foremen in Florida, a very close comparison with our estimate of 19,660 [10]. The relative proportion is 30 per cent, the same as shown in Table 10. The similarity of the estimates from the Farm Labor Survey with the Census of Population tends to support the finding that there are relatively more women employed in agriculture in Florida than is the case for the total U.S. hired farm labor force.

As one might expect, the distribution changes considerably if an adjustment is made for the degree of participation in the labor force. A labor force participant is defined for purposes of this report as a person who is working with or without wages, self-employed, looking for work, traveling to a new job wanting work although not looking, or not working as a result

Table 10.—Age and sex distribution of Florida agricultural workers.†

Age	Number of workers			Percentage of workers		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Under 16	124	127	251	.3	.6	.4
16 - 19	4,297	2,486	6,783	9.3	12.6	10.3
20 - 24	4,317	2,175	6,493	9.4	11.1	9.9
25 - 29	4,118	2,564	6,682	9.0	13.0	10.2
30 - 34	4,523	1,538	6,062	9.8	7.8	9.2
35 - 39	5,113	1,241	6,354	11.1	6.3	9.7
40 - 44	6,004	3,080	9,084	13.1	15.7	13.8
45 - 49	3,577	2,058	5,636	7.8	10.5	8.6
50 - 54	4,146	2,066	6,212	9.0	10.5	9.5
55 - 59	3,643	1,876	5,520	7.9	9.5	8.4
60 - 64	3,527	280	3,807	7.7	1.4	5.8
65 - 69	1,577	96	1,674	3.4	.5	2.6
70 or over	922	67	1,060	2.2	.3	1.6
Total	45,964	19,660	65,624	70.0	30.0	100.0

†The estimates are based on workers at the time of interview. Estimates of total workers will differ among tables due to different inclusions of workers and missing data for particular characteristics of some workers. Columns and rows of this and succeeding tables may not add to the totals due to the truncations of estimates.

of bad weather. After separating workers into those who were labor force participants during each of the 52 weeks and those who were nonparticipants for some of the weeks,[7] only 23 per cent of the full-time participants were women. Eighty-two per cent of the male participants were participants over all 52 weeks in comparison to 56 per cent of the female participants. Thus, the female segment of the labor force is considerably more seasonal than the male segment.

Marital Status

Somewhat more than half of the Florida farm labor force are married and living with their spouses; this is true of 56 per cent, as shown in Table 11. There is some variation between the sexes, but not a considerable amount.[8]

[7] Nonparticipant categories include retirement, vacation, school, sick or injured, and housekeeping.

[8] The null hypothesis that the sex and marital status classifications (married vs. single) are independent is rejected at the 1 per cent level by the Chi Square test. See [2, Ch. 5] for a discussion of this test.

Table 11.—Marital status of farm workers, Florida.†

Marital status	Male		Female		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Married	25,882	56.3	10,855	55.2	36,737	56.0
Single	20,080	43.7	8,816	44.8	38,898	44.0
Widowed††	2,014	10.0	1,870	21.2	3,885	13.4
Divorced††	2,304	11.5	930	10.5	3,235	11.2
Separated††	4,119	20.5	2,475	28.1	6,594	22.8
Never married††	11,643	58.0	3,541	40.2	15,184	52.5

†Population at time of interview.

††The percentages are taken as percentages of single persons.

Education

The educational level of agricultural workers is skewed toward minimal education in comparison to the general population of Florida. As shown in Table 12, 60 per cent of the workers had an eighth grade education or less, while four per cent had no formal education. By comparison, 2 per cent of the Florida general population[9] had no formal education and only 28 per cent had an eighth grade education or less [10]. There are considerable differences in the educational levels among ethnic groups.

Migratory Status

Although the majority of workers did not migrate for work, 29 per cent of the workers reported that they had crossed county lines for work during the previous year (Table 13). Most workers who migrated for work went to another state rather than just to another county in Florida. The migratory workers in Table 13 are separated into those who migrated only within Florida, and those who crossed state lines for work. The former group, *intrastate workers, represented only 3.5 per cent of the workers,* whereas *interstate workers amounted to 25.5 per cent of all workers.* Intrastate workers will be defined throughout the remainder of this section as those workers who worked only in Florida, irrespective of whether they

[9] This includes the Florida population 25 years or over.

Table 12.—Education level of workers, Florida.†

Type of worker	Years of school completed				
	0	1-4	5-8	9-12	13 and over
All workers	2,849 (4.3)	12,038 (18.0)	24,830 (37.2)	24,398 (36.6)	2,628 (3.9)
Ethnic group					
White	237 (1.1)	2,382 (10.8)	8,073 (36.7)	9,223 (42.0)	2,069 (9.4)
Black	2,046 (5.5)	7,516 (20.1)	12,941 (34.6)	14,391 (38.5)	521 (1.4)
Puerto Rican	358 (17.7)	793 (39.1)	693 (34.2)	182 (9.0)	0 0
Mexican	188 (4.4)	958 (22.5)	2,647 (62.1)	456 (10.7)	12 (0.3)
Other	20 (1.9)	389 (36.8)	477 (45.1)	146 (13.8)	27 (2.5)
Migratory status					
Interstate	635 (3.7)	3,277 (18.9)	7,541 (43.4)	5,842 (33.6)	85 (0.5)
Intrastate††	2,214 (4.5)	8,761 (17.7)	17,294 (35.0)	18,590 (37.6)	2,543 (5.1)

†Numbers in parentheses are percentages.

††This includes all workers who worked only within Florida, irrespective of whether or not they migrated within the state.

worked in one or more locations within the state. Most of the intrastate workers, so defined, worked in only one location (Table 13).

Some variation between the sexes exists for those who are migrants. Fewer female workers are migratory workers, but the difference is not as much as one might expect. Differences between interstate and intrastate workers in educational levels

Table 13.—Migratory status of workers, Florida.

Sex	Non-migrant	Intra-state	Inter-state	Non-migrant	Intra-state	Inter-state
	Number			Per cent		
All workers	46,536	2,302	16,759	70.9	3.5	25.5
Male	31,894	1,464	12,568	69.4	3.2	27.4
Female	14,642	839	4,191	74.4	4.3	21.3

are shown in Table 12. Again, there are differences in the two groups, with the distribution being relatively skewed toward the lower educational levels for the interstate workers. Those with no more than an eighth grade educational level represented 66 per cent of the interstate workers in comparison to 57 per cent of the intrastate workers.

Ethnic Groups

The workers were categorized into four distinct ethnic groups: white, black, Puerto Rican, and Mexican. The relative numbers found in each are shown in Table 14. The largest proportion of the worker population was found to be black, representing 56 per cent of all workers. The white group was the only other major component, representing 33 per cent of all workers. By comparison, the general population of Florida is categorized as 84 per cent white and 15 per cent black [10]. The labor force of Florida, similar to the general population, is 75 per cent white and 15 per cent nonwhite [10]. The Florida agricultural worker population also differs from the U.S. agricultural worker population in this characteristic: 78 per cent

Table 14.—Agricultural workers by ethnic group, Florida.†

Worker category	White	Black	Puerto Rican	Mexican	Other
All workers	21,594 (32.9)	36,710 (56.0)	2,026 (3.1)	4,209 (6.4)	1,057 (1.6)
Sex††					
Male	16,634 (36.2)	24,382 (53.1)	1,790 (3.9)	2,748 (6.0)	369 (0.8)
Female	4,960 (25.2)	12,328 (62.7)	236 (1.2)	1,461 (7.4)	688 (3.5)
Migratory status***					
Intrastate workers****	15,214 (36.1)	23,578 (55.9)	1,020 (2.4)	1,484 (3.5)	893 (2.1)
Interstate workers	2,118 (15.1)	8,464 (60.5)	906 (6.5)	2,395 (17.1)	100 (0.7)

†Numbers in parentheses are percentages.
††Includes all survey workers.
***Includes only workers reporting weeks of farm work.
****Intrastate workers may or may not have migrated within the state. As shown in Table 13, few workers migrate within the state only.

of the latter group were white and 22 per cent nonwhite [9, p. 10]. Thus, not only is the nonwhite worker over represented in the Florida farm worker population by contrast to the general Florida population, but also by comparison to the U.S. agricultural hired labor force.

When the workers are grouped by sex, it is seen that females are more likely to be black than are males. In the female group 63 per cent were black, whereas 53 per cent of the males were black.

The ethnic group distribution varies somewhat with migratory status. Again, blacks accounted for the largest proportion of interstate workers, 60 per cent of the group. The major difference in composition is that over half of the Mexican workers were interstate workers, representing 17 per cent of the interstate migratory workers. As a result, those categorized in the white group represented only 15 per cent of the interstate migrants.

The educational level varies significantly among ethnic groups. As shown in Table 12, the white group had by far the most years of education. All other groups were skewed to fewer years relative to the white group. The Puerto Rican group, although not a major component of the work force, had by far the least number of years of education. The following are the percentages of the groups who had four years or less of formal education:

Group	Per cent with four years education or less
White	12
Black	26
Puerto Rican	57
Mexican	27
Other	39

These differences are far greater than differences in educational level by migatory status.

It is interesting to note that these percentages differ from those of the general Florida population. For example, 22 per cent of the workers in this survey had four or less years of education, in comparison to 6 per cent of the general population. As indicated above, 12 per cent of the white group had four years or fewer, compared with 4 per cent of the general population white group in this category. In the nonwhite group, 27 per cent had four years or fewer of education in comparison to 21 per cent for the nonwhite general population [10]. In

each case, the farm worker is at the lower end of the educational level in comparison to the general population. However, the relative difference between the nonwhite farm workers and the general population is not as great as for the white workers.

Economic Characteristics

Labor Force Participation

The workers were also separated into two groups depending upon their degree of labor force participation — all year or part of the year (Table 15). A worker was classified as a participant for the entire year if he responded that he was either employed, self-employed, looking for work, wanting work, traveling to a new job, or not working due to bad weather during each of the 52 weeks. He was classified as a part-year participant if he satisfied one of the above criteria for at least one week and had at least one week of retirement, vacation, school, illness, housekeeping, or some other activity not directly associated with employment.

Table 15.—Labor force participation, Florida.†

	All year			Part of year		
Worker group	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female
All workers	41,726 (74.2)	32,269 (82.3)	9,457 (55.6)	14,488 (25.8)	6,946 (17.7)	7,542 (44.4)
Ethnic group						
White	13,732 (79.2)	11,997 (88.7)	1,734 (45.5)	3,600 (20.8)	1,527 (11.3)	2,071 (54.5)
Black	22,954 (71.6)	16,563 (78.7)	6,391 (58.1)	9,088 (28.4)	4,480 (21.3)	4,607 (41.9)
Puerto Rican	1,621 (84.2)	1,427 (84.4)	192 (81.4)	305 (15.8)	262 (15.6)	43 (18.6)
Mexican	2,756 (71.1)	2,009 (78.1)	746 (57.2)	1,122 (28.9)	564 (21.9)	557 (42.8)
Other	642 (64.7)	250 (73.3)	391 (60.0)	350 (35.3)	89 (26.7)	261 (40.0)
Migratory status						
Nonmigrant	29,160 (73.1)	22,427 (82.9)	6,732 (52.5)	10,717 (26.9)	4,634 (17.1)	6,081 (47.4)
Migrant	12,528 (76.8)	9,802 (80.9)	2,723 (65.1)	3,770 (23.1)	2,310 (19.1)	1,458 (34.8)

†Numbers in parentheses are percentages.

Those who were participating during the entire 52 weeks represented 74 per cent of the workers with at least one week of farm work, and 26 per cent were out of the labor force at least one week. This level of participation indicates a particularly high degree of attachment to the labor force for the farm workers.[10] When the workers are separated into various groups, the largest differentiation is between the sexes. The degree of participation of males is considerably higher, as expected — 82 per cent were participants all year in comparison to 56 per cent of the females.

The participation rates across ethnic groups are remarkably similar.[11] The Puerto Rican group stands out with 84 per cent being participants during the entire year. One is initially led to infer that the difference is accounted for by the larger proportion of males in the Puerto Rican group. However, 81 per cent of the female Puerto Ricans were all-year participants. Indeed, if one compares the proportion of those who were all-year participants by sex among ethnic groups, it becomes clear that there are substantial differences among the ethnic groups in terms of their participation. For example, 72 per cent of the blacks were all-year participants, in comparison with the average of 74 per cent. Since the ratio of women to men of blacks is larger than the average, one is initially led to infer that this is the reason for lower participation, since women generally participate less than men. Again, this is only partially correct. The data reveal that fewer black men are all-year participants and relatively more black women are all-year participants. The ethnic group breakdown thus reveals more variation among groups than is indicated by a casual inspection of the data.

The migratory workers show slightly more attachment to the labor force than the nonmigrants: 77 per cent were all-year participants in comparison to 73 per cent of the nonmigrants. If one can draw any inference from this, it is that seasonal labor is more common within the local work force than among the migratory workers. Again, there are important differences between the sexes. Among males, 83 per cent of the nonmigrants were all-year participants in comparison to 81 per cent of the

[10]Note that the population is estimated at the point of interview. An alternative procedure would be to estimate the population that had done any work in agriculture during the year. Such a procedure would give a lower proportion of persons participating all 52 weeks.

[11]However, the null hypothesis that the ethnic and participation classfications are independent is rejected at the 1 per cent level by the Chi Square test.

migrants. Among females, the reverse was true: 52 per cent of the nonmigrants were all-year participants, whereas 65 per cent of the migrants were in this category. This major difference in the females apparently accounts for the higher percentage of all-year participants for the migratory group.

Perquisites Received

Workers frequently receive nonmonetary remunerations from their employers in addition to the direct monetary payments. Such perquisites for the nonfarm worker typically are in the form of retirement plans, health insurance, stock options, or a variety of other benefits. The farm worker perquisites are generally of a quite different nature, typically consisting of housing, meals, transportation, or some form of more basic consumption.

Table 16.—Perquisites received by farm workers, Florida.†

Perquisites	All workers		Intrastate workers		Interstate workers	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
All farm workers						
No perquisites	20,916	37.9	18,421	44.1	2,494	18.6
Some perquisites	34,327	62.1	23,378	55.9	10,949	81.4
Housing	17,541	31.8	9,147	21.9	8,392	62.4
Meals	1,950	3.5	979	2.3	969	7.2
Transportation	26,341	47.7	17,999	43.1	8,342	62.0
Other	1,886	3.4	1,303	3.1	583	4.3
All-year participants						
No perquisites	15,549	38.1	13,670	45.1	1,879	17.8
Some perquisites	25,272	61.9	16,629	54.9	8,643	82.1
Housing	14,289	35.0	7,590	25.0	6,699	63.7
Meals	1,579	3.9	782	2.6	797	7.6
Transportation	18,654	45.7	11,957	39.5	6,697	63.6
Other	1,767	4.3	1,225	4.0	542	5.2
Part-year participants						
No perquisites	5,366	37.2	4,751	41.3	615	21.1
Some perquisites	9,054	62.8	6,749	58.7	2,305	78.9
Housing	3,249	22.5	1,557	13.5	1,692	57.9
Meals	369	2.6	197	1.7	172	5.9
Transportation	7,686	53.3	6,041	52.5	1,645	56.3
Other	117	0.8	77	0.7	40	1.4

†Similar information as reported by employers is given in Table 9.

The perquisites received by farm workers in Florida are summarized in Table 16. Sixty-two per cent of the farm workers received some perquisites during the year, leaving 38 per cent who received none. The two most common perquisites were housing and transportation, which were received by 32 per cent and 48 per cent of the farm workers, respectively. Only four per cent received meals, and three per cent received other forms of perquisites.

Relatively more interstate workers received perquisites than was the case for intrastate workers, 81 per cent in comparison to 56 per cent. The largest difference is in housing; 62 per cent of the interstate workers received housing in comparison to 22 per cent of the intrastate workers. Interstate workers were also more likely to have received transportation, 62 per cent versus 43 per cent of the intrastate workers.

The workers are also separated into their respective labor force participation classes in Table 16. One might expect more all-year participants than part-year participants to receive perquisites. However, there appears to be little difference between the two groups. Any real difference may be obscured by the criterion for classification into the perquisite categories: receipt of the perquisite during at least one week of the year. The only apparent difference in the two groups is that relatively fewer part-year participants received housing and relatively more received transportation.

Labor Force Participation and Earnings

One of the important economic facts describing workers is their earnings. The average annual hired earnings of farm workers in Florida were $3,764 from farm and nonfarm work (Table 17). Although a few of the workers had some self-employment earnings, $3,764 is for all practical purposes their average income. They worked an average of 46.5 weeks to earn this income. The remaining 5.5 weeks were separated into four weeks out of the labor force and 1.5 weeks of labor force unemployment.[12]

The average earnings of Florida agricultural workers are considerably different than for U.S. farm workers. The U.S. hired farm labor force of 1970 was reported to have average annual wages of $1,640 with 127 days of work [9, p. 15]. There

[12]Recall that labor force unemployment is defined as the worker looking for work, wanting work, traveling to a new job, or not working due to bad weather. All other types of unemployment are classified as out of the labor force.

Table 17.—Labor force participation and earnings of farm workers, Florida.

Worker group	Workers	Average hired earnings	Average weeks of work	Average weeks labor force unemployment	Average weeks out of labor force
Persons with farm work	56,216	3,764	46.5	1.6	4.0
Labor force participation of farm workers					
All year	41,726	4,178	50.3	1.7	0.0
Part year	14,488	2,571	35.5	1.1	15.5
Farm vs. nonfarm work					
Farm work only	45,937	3,728	46.5	1.4	4.1
Farm and nonfarm work	10,274	3,926	46.3	2.0	3.6
Nonfarm work only†	6,689	4,311	43.5	1.6	6.8

†These are workers who were working for a farm employer at the time of interview but had no farm employment during the analysis period.

is no reliable way of converting weeks to days since the number of days worked per week is unknown. However, the important difference to note is that the earnings of U.S. workers are less than half the earnings reported here for the Florida workers.

The average hired earnings vary considerably by degree of labor force participation. Those who were participants all year had average earnings of $4,178 in comparison to $2,571 for the part-year participants. The part-year participants worked an average of 35.5 weeks, but had only 1.1 week of labor force unemployment. These workers were out of the labor force an average of 15.5 weeks.

Nonfarm workers tend to earn more than farm workers. The major portion of farm workers, 82 per cent, reported no nonfarm work. The farm work only group reported average earnings of $3,728, with the same average number of weeks worked as for all farm workers: 46.5. Workers with both farm and nonfarm work had slightly higher earnings of $3,926. Workers with nonfarm work only had earnings of $4,311, although they worked fewer weeks: 43.5. This group also reported an average of 6.8 weeks out of the labor force. This relationship

of earnings among the different groups is characteristic of the U.S. farm labor force also [9, p. 15].

Summary

The Florida hired farm labor force has been found to be similar in many ways to the U.S. hired farm labor force. Some of the findings were expected but others were unexpected. As was commonly known, the hired farm labor force is composed mainly of minority groups; only 31 per cent were categorized at white. The major component was black workers, representing over half of the hired farm workers. The educational level of the workers was found to be substantially lower than is the case for the general population.

The worker population had annual earnings averaging $3,-764, substantially less than for the general labor force. However, this is significantly larger than the estimate reported for the U.S. hired farm labor force. The degree of attachment to the labor force was also found to be higher than is commonly believed; agricultural workers were employed an average of 46.5 weeks. Migratory workers were also found to have more attachment to the labor force than those who did not migrate for work. As shown above, 77 per cent of the migratory workers were all-year participants, whereas 73 per cent of the non-migratory workers were all-year participants.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE — IMPACT AND FEASIBILITY

The Unemployment Insurance System

The unemployment insurance system collects taxes on payrolls while persons are employed and pays out benefits to eligible workers who become involuntarily unemployed through no fault of their own. The system is a federal-state cooperative one. Basic coverage and taxing provisions are shaped by federal law, but states are free to go beyond federal standards. Federal law has little to say about the payment of benefits to unemployed persons, and a bewildering array of practices are in effect in the various states. Nevertheless, there are many common features of the benefit provisions among the states.

The present unemployment insurance (U.I.) program was established in the United States in 1935 to provide income loss protection to workers who become unemployed through no fault of their own. Technically, the coverage provisions of state unemployment insurance laws determine the employers who are liable for contributions, and the benefit provisions determine

the workers who accrue eligibility rights under the laws. Coverage is generally defined in terms of the employing unit's payroll or the number of weeks with a minimal number of employees during a calendar year, the contractual relationship of the workers to the employer, and the place and type of work done by the employees. While the system is compulsory and broadly based, it excludes agricultural and certain other groups of workers in both the federal and the Florida state laws. The coverage provisions of state laws, however, are influenced by the taxing provisions of the Social Security Act, now the Federal Unemployment Tax Act. Employers who pay contributions under an approved state unemployment insurance act may credit their state tax against the federal tax, up to a specific limit. Federal law may also require, as a condition for approval of the state law, that certain services excluded from federal coverage under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act be covered under state law, e.g., services performed for state institutions of higher education. Federal law also establishes minimum criteria for the size of a firm which is liable for contributions. The present federal definition of covered employers involves a quarterly payroll of at least $1500 in the calendar year or preceding calendar year, or at least one worker who worked at least 20 weeks.

While income protection for workers during periods of involuntary unemployment is the primary objective of a federal-state unemployment insurance system, the U.I. program also serves to stabilize the economy, maintain a permanent work force for employers, encourage employers to stabilize their employment practices, and make it possible for workers to preserve their skills by having time to search for a job which uses their skills.

In Florida, employer coverage provisions are essentially identical with federal minimum requirements, i.e., employers with at least a $1500 quarterly payroll or at least one worker in at least 20 weeks are required to provide U.I. protection for their workers, unless specifically excepted. Employers of agricultural workers in Florida are presently among the diminishing number of employer groups excluded from both state and federal coverage provisions. Beginning with January of 1972 newly covered employers are required to contribute 1 per cent of their taxable payroll to the state fund and 0.5 per cent for administrative and other purposes. Assuming three years of "experience" under the program, an employer's state tax rate is adjusted between 0 and 4.5 per cent of taxable payroll, excluding the 0.5 per cent administrative tax. Taxable payroll is de-

fined as the annual payroll of an individual worker not exceeding $4,200. Thus, a newly covered employer is required to contribute a maximum of $42 per employee in U.I. taxes, excluding the administrative tax, while "experienced" employers with the worst possible "experience rating" are required to annually contribute a maximum of $189 per worker, excluding a maximum administrative tax of $21. The minimum total tax for an "experienced" employer with a "perfect" experience rating would be ½ per cent of taxable payroll or a maximum of $21.[12]

In 1971 the cost rate in Florida for all covered employers averaged 0.92 per cent of taxable payroll, exclusive of the administrative tax. That is, benefit payments to eligible and unemployed workers required slightly less than 1 per cent of taxable payroll [5, p. 19]. The cost rate varied considerably depending upon the industry grouping. For the Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate industries, the cost rate was 0.50 per cent, while the cost rate was 1.66 per cent for all manufacturing, 6.45 per cent for citrus processing, and 7.97 per cent for citrus packing [5, pp 20-21].

Eligibility for worker U.I. benefits in Florida requires at least 20 weeks of employment at an average rate of pay of $20 or more. For an eligible claimant, weekly benefits are computed to be half of his average weekly wage in the base period. The minimum weekly benefit amount for total unemployment is $10 per week for 10 weeks up to a maximum of $74 and 26 weeks for total unemployment.[13]

Proposals for Extending Unemployment Insurance to Agriculture

The most serious attempt to include federal unemployment insurance provisions for agricultural employers occurred in the Employment Security Amendments of 1970. The Administration proposed that the coverage criterion for agricultural employers be at least four or more workers for at least 20 calendar weeks. While this proposal was rejected by the House, the Senate unanimously passed an alternative proposal to cover employers with eight or more workers for at least 26 weeks. The Senate version, however, failed to become law, since the Joint House-

[12]For 1972, however, even covered employers in Florida with "perfect" experience ratings were required to pay a minimum tax of 0.07 per cent of taxable payroll, plus the 0.5 per cent administrative tax.

[13]The maximum duration for receiving benefits was extended in 1971 to 39 weeks for periods of high rates of unemployment when many workers cannot find a job and have exhausted their initial benefits.

Senate Conference Committee postponed action until additional research dealing with farm coverage was undertaken. This report is a partial response to that Congressional mandate for additional research and information.

Even without federal law, individual states may require agricultural coverage. Most recently, Minnesota passed legislation in 1973 for mandatory coverage of agricultural employers with four or more workers in 20 or more weeks. Hawaii enacted mandatory coverage in 1959 to cover relatively large agricultural employers. The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico provides unemployment insurance protection for its sugarcane workers. Our northern neighbor, Canada, provides coverage for agriculture, excluding certain temporary workers.

States are reluctant to adopt mandatory legislation unless other states follow suit. One major reason why individual states have not extended coverage to agricultural labor, assuming the absence of federal coverage, involves the problem of interstate or interregional competition. Since unemployment insurance increases the employers' cost of conducting business, state law embracing agriculture may serve to weaken rather than strengthen the competitive position of a state's agricultural economy. This same problem of interregional competition originally blocked individual state action to cover industrial workers before the federal unemployment insurance law was enacted in 1935.

Even without specific federal and state U.I. legislation, employers may "elect" to provide unemployment insurance for their agricultural workers. Relatively few agricultural employers in Florida and elsewhere are on this "free election" basis. The largest contingent of farm employers voluntarily electing coverage is in California. This is largely due to provisions contained in collective bargaining agreements requiring unemployment insurance protection for workers covered by the agreement. It is believed that a large percentage of the labor contracts in California agriculture involve the provision of unemployment insurance as a fringe benefit. It can be argued that U.I. within the framework of a collective bargaining agreement stabilizes the labor force and results in reduced costs of recruitment and turnover.

Impact of Alternative Coverage Provisions Upon Florida Agricultural Employers

If unemployment insurance is extended to agriculture, it is

highly likely that the employer coverage criteria will differ from the prevailing nonagricultural provisions of at least one worker for 20 weeks or a quarterly payroll of $1500. This expected distinction in agricultural coverage is due primarily to the administrative difficulties of collecting U.I. taxes from small employers in agriculture.

Although data were developed for over 100 employer coverage provisions, only the following five alternative provisions are reported here: one worker in 20 weeks or $1500 high quarterly payroll—the current Florida provision; four workers in 20 weeks—the Administration's 1969 proposal; eight workers in 26 weeks—the version passed by the U.S. Senate in 1970; four workers in 20 weeks or $5000 quarterly payroll—a slight variation of the 1969 Administrative proposal; and 15 workers in 52 weeks—an unlikely legislative proposal but an alternative that includes the relatively large and nonseasonal agricultural employers.

Farm and Nonfarm Employers

Adoption of the current employer coverage provisions of at least one worker employed for at least 20 weeks or a $1500 payroll would virtually require all farm and nonfarm employers to provide U.I. protection for their workers. As one moves from the 1 in 20 or $1500 provision to the 15 in 52 provision in Table 18, the number of employers covered drops markedly for farm employers and declines to zero for labor contractors. Table 18 provides evidence that the 321 farm employers in Florida with at least 15 workers the year around also employ approximately ½ of the wage items. As is generally known, labor contractors do not employ workers on a year around basis. It is somewhat interesting to note, however, that 290 labor contractors in Florida would be covered under the eight workers in 26 weeks rule and that this criterion would cover approximately 70 per cent of the wage items of these employers. Other nonfarm employers, such as cooperative marketing associations involved with harvesting operations, are relatively less seasonal than the labor contractors, since the 8 in 26 provision covers about 95 per cent of the wage items (Table 18).

Type of Ownership

Table 19 presents the sharp contrast for the selected coverage criteria between the individual and family farm/small

corporations and the corporations with more than 10 stockholders. While the 1 in 20 or $1500 provision would essentially cover both groups of ownership equally, the adoption of the 4 in 20 provision, for example, would cover approximately ½ of the family/small corporation employers but all of the corporate agricultural employers with more than 10 stockholders. In terms of wage items, the 4 in 20 provision would cover ¾ of the regular and seasonal wage items of the individual, family/small corporate farms, while, of course, covering all wage items for the corporations with more than 10 stockholders (Table 19).

Economic Class of Farm

In the four coverage criteria—1 in 20 or $1500 quarterly, 4 in 20 or $5000 quarterly, 4 in 20, and 8 in 26—all would cover roughly 90 per cent or more of the wage items of farms with sales of at least $40,000 in a calendar year, i.e., Class I farms. However, less than half of the Class I employers would be covered under a provision of at least eight workers employed at least 26 weeks. As one would expect, average gross payroll of Class I employers rises as one moves from the 1 in 20 or $1500 provision to the 15 in 52 provision or from $79,497 to $349,179 (Table 20).

While the 1 in 20 or $1500 provision would cover the bulk of the farm employers with sales of less than $40,000 in a calendar year, less than 20 per cent of the Class II, III, and IV employers considered as a group would be covered under the 4 in 20 or $5000 provision. Moreover, less than 3 per cent of the employers with sales of less than $40,000 would be covered with the adoption of the 8 in 26 coverage provision. Also, roughly 50 per cent of the wage items of these relatively small farms would be covered under the 4 in 20 provision; the move to the 8 in 26 provision would decrease the affected wage items to about 30 per cent of the total for Economic Classes II, III, and IV (Table 20).

Type of Farm

There are considerable differences of the probable impact of a U.I. program among the 10 major types of farming in Florida, except for the 1 in 20 or $1500 provision. The application of Florida's current coverage provision of one worker in 20 weeks or $1500 high quarterly payroll is tantamount to universal coverage for both farm employers and workers. Table 21 provides the number of employers, average gross payroll, and

Table 18.—Effect of selected alternative coverage provisions upon farm and nonfarm agricultural employers in Florida.

Type of employer and coverage provision	Number of employers	Average gross payroll per employer	Average wage items per employer	Per cent of wage items covered	Average number of seasonal wage items per employer	Per cent of seasonal wage items covered
workers/weeks		$				
All employers						
1 in 20 or $1500 Qtr.	5,116	47,337	67	99.7	55	99.6
4 in 20 or $5000 Qtr.	2,712	84,732	121	95.5	100	95.8
4 in 20	2,494	88,997	120	87.4	99	86.8
8 in 26	1,468	135,845	185	79.0	153	78.8
15 in 52	328	340,320	334	31.9	264	30.5
Farm employers						
1 in 20 or $1500 Qtr.	4,485	46,253	50	99.6	39	99.5
4 in 20 or $5000 Qtr.	2,184	89,584	96	93.3	75	93.3
4 in 20	1,992	95,857	103	91.7	81	91.6
8 in 26	1,113	153,704	166	82.0	131	82.5
15 in 52	321	344,362	340	48.7	269	49.1

Table 18.—Effect of selected alternative coverage provisions upon farm and nonfarm agricultural employers in Florida—Continued.

Type of employer and coverage provision	Number of employers	Average gross payroll per employer	Average wage items per employer	Per cent of wage items covered	Average number of seasonal wage items per employer	Per cent of seasonal wage items covered
workers/weeks		$				
Labor contractors						
1 in 20 or $1500 Qtr.	499	53,851	231	99.9	212	99.9
4 in 20 or $5000 Qtr.	437	55,187	238	99.9	218	99.9
4 in 20	411	51,030	194	76.6	177	76.3
8 in 26	290	64,492	251	70.1	230	69.7
15 in 52	0	0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Other nonfarm employers						
1 in 20 or $1500 Qtr.	182	57,983	83	99.9	70	99.9
4 in 20 or $5000 Qtr.	91	110,166	162	98.1	138	98.9
4 in 20	91	110,166	162	98.1	138	98.9
8 in 26	65	148,398	221	95.2	188	96.3
15 in 52	7	160,000	55	2.6	30	1.7

Table 19.—Type of ownership and selected alternative coverage provisions in Florida.

Type of employer and coverage provision	Number of employers	Average gross payroll per employer	Average wage items per employer	Per cent of wage items covered	Average number of seasonal wage items per employer	Per cent of seasonal wage items covered
workers/weeks		$				
Individual, family, partnership, and corporation with 10 or fewer stockholders						
1 in 20 or $1500 Qtr.	5,022	40,036	59	99.7	49	99.6
4 in 20 or $5000 Qtr.	2,618	72,073	108	94.8	90	95.2
4 in 20	2,399	65,791	106	85.4	88	84.8
8 in 26	1,384	114,333	163	75.8	136	75.8
15 in 52	292	264,830	257	25.3	206	24.3
Corporations with more than 10 stockholders						
1 in 20 or $1500 Qtr.	83	492,716	554	100.0	430	100.0
4 in 20 or $5000 Qtr.	83	492,716	554	100.0	430	100.0
4 in 20	83	492,716	554	100.0	430	100.0
8 in 26	83	492,716	554	100.0	430	100.0
15 in 52	36	955,996	965	74.9	735	73.4

Table 20.—Economic class of farm and selected alternative coverage provisions in Florida.

Economic class of farm† and coverage provision	Number of employers	Average gross payroll per employer	Average wage items per employer	Per cent of wage items covered	Average number of seasonal wage items per employer	Per cent of seasonal wage items covered
workers/weeks		$				
Class I						
1 in 20 or $1500 Qtr.	2,373	79,497	84	99.8	66	99.8
4 in 20 or $5000 Qtr.	1,754	104,601	112	98.1	88	98.3
4 in 20	1,651	109,143	117	96.9	92	97.0
8 in 26	1,046	157,706	169	88.5	134	89.2
15 in 52	314	349,179	345	54.3	275	55.0
Classes II, III, and IV						
1 in 20 or $1500 Qtr.	2,101	8,916	12	97.7	9	97.0
4 in 20 or $5000 Qtr.	430	28,307	32	54.9	24	53.2
4 in 20	341	31,466	36	49.5	27	47.4
8 in 26	66	90,833	112	30.0	82	28.1
15 in 52	7	138,142	117	3.3	38	1.4

†See page 29.

Table 21.—Type of farm and selected alternative coverage provisions in Florida.

Type of farm and coverage provision	Number of employers	Average gross payroll per employer	Average wage items per employer	Per cent of wage items covered	Average number of seasonal wage items per employer	Per cent of seasonal wage items covered
workers/weeks		$				
Cash grain						
1 in 20 or $1500 Qtr.	69	62,265	56	100.0	26	100.0
4 in 20 or $5000 Qtr.	22	183,753	162	93.1	72	88.7
4 in 20	22	183,753	162	93.1	72	88.7
8 in 26	22	183,753	162	93.1	72	88.7
15 in 52	4	478,548	473	45.2	434	88.7
Tobacco						
1 in 20 or $1500 Qtr.	220	29,572	60	100.0	54	100.0
4 in 20 or $5000 Qtr.	120	49,756	91	83.8	82	83.6
4 in 20	98	57,391	110	82.2	98	82.0
8 in 26	62	82,690	151	71.8	138	73.0
15 in 52	10	181,207	367	28.4	344	29.6
Other field crops						
1 in 20 or $1500 Qtr.	241	101,082	57	100.0	33	100.0
4 in 20 or $5000 Qtr.	186	129,293	73	98.3	42	97.9
4 in 20	186	129,293	73	98.3	42	97.9
8 in 26	117	191,090	105	89.0	58	84.8
15 in 52	27	536,653	192	37.4	88	29.4

Table 21.—Type of farm and selected alternative coverage provisions in Florida—Continued.

Type of farm and coverage provision	Number of employers	Average gross payroll per employer	Average wage items per employer	Per cent of wage items covered	Average number of seasonal wage items per employer	Per cent of seasonal wage items covered
workers/weeks		$				
Vegetables						
1 in 20 or $1500 Qtr.	293	93,141	135	100.0	118	100.0
4 in 20 or $5000 Qtr.	180	147,156	214	97.4	187	97.5
4 in 20	146	171,366	254	93.8	221	93.6
8 in 26	72	316,458	453	82.1	390	81.1
15 in 52	26	736,731	1,121	73.5	971	73.0
Fruit and nut						
1 in 20 or $1500 Qtr.	1,425	53,425	74	99.7	62	99.7
4 in 20 or $5000 Qtr.	608	118,573	168	96.8	142	97.5
4 in 20	540	131,013	187	96.2	158	97.0
8 in 26	308	211,281	304	88.7	258	90.1
15 in 52	94	458,714	550	48.9	462	49.0
Poultry						
1 in 20 or $1500 Qtr.	235	16,666	14	99.0	9	98.5
4 in 20 or $5000 Qtr.	72	42,404	32	69.7	20	67.5
4 in 20	72	42,404	32	69.7	20	67.5
8 in 26	25	101,457	75	58.0	48	57.2
15 in 52	11	212,296	130	45.3	76	40.4

Table 21.—Type of farm and selected alternative coverage provisions in Florida—Continued.

Type of farm and coverage provision	Number of employers	Average gross payroll per employer	Average wage items per employer	Per cent of wage items covered	Average number of wage items seasonal per employer	Per cent of seasonal wage items covered
workers/weeks		$				
Dairy						
1 in 20 or $1500 Qtr.	271	50,411	25	100.0	12	100.0
4 in 20 or $5000 Qtr.	202	65,153	31	93.0	14	89.4
4 in 20	202	65,153	31	93.0	14	89.4
8 in 26	103	107,501	52	78.1	23	74.6
15 in 52	39	169,496	92	52.5	44	54.4
Livestock						
1 in 20 or $1500 Qtr.	691	13,321	10	94.7	7	93.0
4 in 20 or $5000 Qtr.	157	45,097	25	53.6	17	49.5
4 in 20	109	50,703	30	45.4	20	40.6
8 in 26	24	157,759	100	33.7	73	32.8
15 in 52	5	425,298	279	19.0	200	18.2
General						
1 in 20 or $1500 Qtr.	282	41,625	38	98.6	28	98.1
4 in 20 or $5000 Qtr.	208	55,064	47	89.6	34	87.4
4 in 20	197	57,434	47	86.3	34	83.0
8 in 26	103	85,211	72	68.9	54	68.7
15 in 52	15	167,991	84	11.9	41	7.7

Table 21.—Type of farm and selected alternative coverage provisions in Florida—Continued.

Type of farm and coverage provision	Number of employers	Average gross payroll per employer	Average wage items per employer	Per cent of wage items covered	Average number of seasonal wage items per employer	Per cent of seasonal wage items covered
workers/weeks		$				
Miscellaneous						
1 in 20 or $1500 Qtr.	758	40,022	27	99.6	17	99.3
4 in 20 or $5000 Qtr.	429	65,943	43	90.0	26	87.8
4 in 20	418	67,530	44	88.6	26	85.5
8 in 26	276	92,366	58	76.6	36	76.6
15 in 52	90	186,132	114	50.0	71	50.3

average wage items per employer for the five alternative coverage criteria for cash grain, tobacco, other field crops (includes sugarcane), vegetables, fruit and nut, poultry, dairy, livestock, general, and miscellaneous farms. A glimpse at the alternative of at least 15 workers in 52 weeks reveals some interesting data regarding the concentration (or lack thereof) of wage items among relatively few employers. For example, although the 15 in 52 provision accounts for a meager percentage of farm employers for all 10 types of farming, this provision would "cover" roughly 50 per cent or more of the wage items in the vegetable, fruit and nut, dairy, and miscellaneous industries. On the other hand, less than 30 per cent of the wage items in the tobacco, livestock, and general agricultural industries would be covered by this somewhat unrealistic provision. As expected, average payroll per employer increases rather sharply as one moves from the 1 in 20 or $1500 provision to the 15 in 52 provision (Table 21).

Worker Protection and Benefits

On the basis of the Florida field survey of workers conducted in the November 1970 through February 1971 period, the population of agricultural workers was estimated to be 66,778. There were 64,568 who reported complete information on items pertaining to the remainder of this section. In order to conform to a common historical period for the regional analysis, an "analysis year" of July 1969 through June 1970 was used in determining worker protection and beneficiary status. Thus, it was found that 2,731 of the 64,568 workers were not in the labor force during the analysis year, while 6,593 workers reported nonagricultural work only during the analysis period. Of the 55,243 workers reporting agricultural work during the analysis year, 41,799 or 75.7 per cent did *not* cross state lines to engage in employment (Table 22).

Potential Beneficiaries

Of the 55,243 workers reporting agricultural work in the analysis year, 52,738 or 95.5 per cent were potential beneficiaries of unemployment insurance, assuming full coverage. That is, 95.5 per cent of Florida's agricultural workers were employed at least 20 weeks for an average weekly wage of $20 or more. There was very little difference between interstate and intrastate potential beneficiaries in terms of average weeks of em-

Table 22.—Florida farm workers by employment status during analysis year.†

Employment status	Number of workers
All workers	64,568
No hired work during analysis year††	2,731
Nonagricultural work only	6,593
Agricultural workers	55,243
All intrastate agricultural workers	41,799
Intrastate — hired agricultural work only	35,903
All interstate agricultural workers	13,443
Interstate — hired agricultural work only	9,308

†The estimates are based on workers at the time of interview. Estimates of total workers will differ among tables due to different inclusions of workers and missing data for particular characteristics of some workers. Columns and rows of this and succeeding tables may not add to the totals due to the truncation of estimates.

††The analysis year is the period July 1969 through June 1970.

ployment, average earnings, average potential weekly benefit amount, and average potential duration of benefits (Table 23).

Actual Beneficiaries

Actual beneficiaries are persons who are potential beneficiaries having at least one period of compensable unemployment in the record year. In order to receive unemployment insurance benefits, however, a worker must be involuntarily unemployed through no fault of his own and be ready, able, and willing to work at a job comparable to his previous position. For purposes of this study, however, all weeks of unemployment were assumed to be compensable except for weeks of paid vacation, school attendance, and sickness or injury.

Of the 52,738 potential beneficiaries with agricultural work experience in the analysis year, 16,130 or 30.6 per cent were actually eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits, assuming full coverage. A somewhat higher percentage of interstate potential beneficiaries (37.9 per cent) become actual beneficiaries, compared with intrastate potential beneficiaries (28.2 per cent). Women are also more likely to become actual beneficiaries than men. While women account for only 30 per cent of the agricultural work force, they contributed over half of

Table 23.—Earnings and employment of potential and nonbeneficiaries, by migratory status, Florida (full coverage).

	Only intrastate work	Interstate hired work	All agricultural workers
All agricultural workers	(41,799)	(13,443)	(55,243)
Per cent of all agricultural workers	75.7	24.3	100.0
Average weeks of work	45.8	47.6	46.3
Average earnings per week of work	$82.3	$80.9	$82.0
Potential beneficiaries	(39,578)	(13,160)	(52,738)
Per cent of all agricultural workers	71.6	23.8	95.5
Average weeks of work	47.5	48.1	47.6
Average earnings per week of work	$83.0	$81.2	$82.5
Average weekly entitlement	$37.9	$38.8	$38.1
Average duration of entitlement	23.8	24.1	23.9
Nonbeneficiaries	(2,221)	(282)	(2,504)
Per cent of all agricultural workers	4.0	0.5	4.5
Average weeks of work	16.3	21.7†	16.9
Average earnings per week of work	$50.7	$53.9†	$51.2

†This result may be explained by an example. Assume two workers, one working for 40 weeks at $15 per week and the other for two weeks at $100 per week. Average weeks of work would be 21 weeks and average weekly earnings would be $57.50 but neither one would be potential beneficiaries.

the actual beneficiaries. There was only slight variation in incidence of actual beneficiaries in terms of the age groups reported in Table 24, except that a higher percentage of workers in the 16 to 19 age group were eligible for actual benefits, as compared with other groups. There was, however, a pronounced variation in the incidence of actual beneficiaries based upon ethnic grouping. Black agricultural workers are twice as likely to become actual beneficiaries compared with white agricultural workers. And black interstate (migrant) workers are more likely to become actual beneficiaries compared with intrastate black workers. Puerto Rican workers, surprisingly, tend to demonstrate a relatively low rate of actual beneficiaries (Table 24).

Table 25 presents the average earnings and unemployment situation for the actual beneficiaries under full coverage. The average actual beneficiary is estimated to have worked 39 weeks at an average salary of $70.30 per week. His entitlement to un-

employment insurance benefits is estimated to be $34.70 of weekly benefits for an average duration of 9.5 weeks.

Cost Rates

One of the more commonly used measures of financial feasibility of the extension of unemployment insurance to excluded groups is the dollar cost of benefits paid in relation to taxable payroll. The resulting computation produces a percentage figure that is generally known as the benefit cost rate.

The benefit cost rate estimated on the basis of agricultural work only in Florida, as determined by the Florida Farm Labor Survey, is essentially constant for the alternative employer coverage provisions, or slightly less than 3.0. The benefit cost rate increases to slighly over 3.0 if all agricultural work performed in Florida (but reported by the 14 states in the regional project) is taken into account. But neither the Florida survey nor the regional benefit cost estimates exactly measure the

Table 24.—Actual beneficiaries by selected characteristics, Florida (full coverage).

Type of beneficiary	All farm workers	In labor force		Intrastate	Interstate
		All year	Part year		
All workers	16,130	5,521	10,608	11,144	4,985
Age Group					
16-19	2,329	1,103	1,222	1,534	794
20-29	2,629	841	1,778	1,639	990
30-39	3,160	1,360	1,798	2,270	889
40-49	3,831	1,210	2,619	2,510	1,321
50-59	2,732	791	1,939	1,949	782
60 and over	1,441	204	1,232	1,236	203
Sex					
Male	7,594	2,830	4,762	4,434	3,159
Female	8,536	2,689	5,845	6,710	1,826
Ethnic Group					
White	3,377	869	2,506	2,800	576
Black	11,080	4,239	6,839	7,609	3,471
Puerto Rican	328	136	190	148	180
Mexican	997	263	733	240	757
Other	326	10	316	326	0

Table 25.—Earnings and employment of actual beneficiaries, Florida (full coverage).

Item	Actual beneficiaries
Number	16,130
Weeks of hired work	39.0
Weekly earnings per person ($)	70.3
Weekly benefit amount ($)	34.7
Average duration of benefits (weeks)	9.5

costs of "adding" U.I. protection to agricultural workers. This is because the benefit cost estimates above exclude benefits of workers who were ineligible on the basis of agricultural or nonagricultural work separately, but who were eligible for benefits by combining agricultural and nonagricultural work. Table 26 presents both the benefit cost rates and the added cost rates for the provision of covering employers with at least one worker for 20 weeks or a $1500 quarterly payroll.

The added cost rate for protecting Florida interstate migrant workers is approximately equal to the cost of protecting all Florida agricultural workers, or 2.9 for migrants compared with 2.8 for all workers employed under the 1 in 20 or $1500 provision. As reported by Emerson [4, pp. 24-24], the added cost rate for migrants decreases as one moves to the less inclusive, e.g., 8 in 26 provision, whereas the added cost rate remains the same or increases for all workers taken together.

Limitations of the Analysis

An analysis year was chosen for this study to be consistent with other states pursuing the same type of analysis. Although

Table 26.—Benefit cost rates and added cost rates for Florida agricultural work, present Florida employer coverage provision.

	Provision: At least 1 worker in 20 or more weeks or $1500 high quarterly payroll	
	Benefit cost rate	Added cost rate
Florida agricultural work, Florida Survey	2.77	2.81
Florida agricultural work, Regional Survey	3.04	3.06

the interviewing took place during November 1970 through February 1971, the period under analysis was July 1969 through June 1970. Consequently, the study is based on information reported by workers in some cases 18 months prior to the time of interview. As a result there may have been some memory bias [6, pp. 63-66].

Benefits which an eligible unemployed worker may claim are typically based on a base year which has elapsed prior to the claim. Since it was impractical to collect information this far into the past, the base year was the same as the analysis year. This imposes the assumption that the work histories are repetitive from one year to the next.

Many workers were employed by more than one employer throughout the year. Employer information was collected only for the employer at the time of interview. Other employers for whom the worker had worked were assumed to have been similar to the survey employer. If they had worked for smaller employers during the off-season, this might have an effect on the results. However, since most Florida employers are large, this is not expected to have a significant effect on the results.

The analysis also assumes that worker behavior will be the same as that during the analysis year. However, the worker will face a different set of incentives after the introduction of unemployment insurance. For example, once a worker is unemployed, the cost of remaining unemployed until a job comparable to his abilities is found is diminished by his unemployment insurance benefits. One might expect that his job search would be extended longer than is now the case. Other workers who currently work less than the 20 weeks to be eligible for unemployment insurance benefits, may attempt to increase their working weeks to 20 in order to claim benefits. No adjustment for these reactions has been included in the present analysis. This is a topic for additional research.

POSSIBLE EFFECTS FROM THE IMPLEMENTATION OF AN UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE PROGRAM IN AGRICULTURE

Migration and Unemployment Insurance for Agricultural Workers[15]

Estimates were made of the effect on the cost of unemployment insurance protection for agricultural workers if migratory workers were to alter their migration by assumed proportions.

Although unemployment insurance is not a welfare program in the usual sense of the term, transfer payments are given to unemployed persons who meet the eligibility requirements. One major difference between unemployment insurance benefits and welfare benefits is that the former has a limited period of benefits, generally a maximum of 26 weeks in any benefit year under Florida law, whereas the latter generally has no time limit. Secondly, there is no needs test to receive unemployment insurance benefits as there generally is for welfare benefits. Unemployment insurance is a wage related program using both past and current attachment to the labor force to distinguish between eligible and ineligible workers.

Any program which provides transfer payments to potential labor force participants is confronted with the question of what effect such payments may have on the supply of labor. The basic postulate is generally that leisure time and income are desired entities. Transfer payment schemes characteristically alter the potential combinations of leisure time and income, since the individual is receiving income while he is not working. The question is whether, given the new set of potential combinations, the worker will choose a different (higher or lower) level of contribution to the labor force.[16] If there is, for example, a substantial reduction in labor force participation as a result of such a program, there could be considerable differences in the cost of the program from the estimated cost, which was based on reported levels of participation prior to the existence of the program.

It was assumed that migratory workers would be a group influenced more easily than others by changes in work incentives. An economic rationale for this is that the marginal earnings of migratory workers from working in other states are less than for work in the home state. As a result, it could be argued that the availability of unemployment insurance benefits would reduce the incentive to migrate to another state for work. In addition, the employment agreement between employer and

[15]This section summarizes research done under Contract UIS 72-2 between the U.S. Department of Labor and the University of Florida. This work is described in detail in [3, 4].

[16]The individual faces more constraints with the unemployment insurance program than under a welfare program. For example, he cannot simply quit a job and collect benefits; he is only eligible if he has become unemployed through no fault of his own. There are several other requirements he must also meet, thus making it somewhat more difficult for him to adjust his labor supply and remain eligible for benefits.

migratory worker is typically more casual than is the case for permanent employees. The migratory worker also has the incentive of avoiding the disutility of traveling for extended periods of time if he can arrange to remain in his home state and collect benefits during the slack season. If there is suitable work during this slack season, he would be required to accept it in lieu of receiving benefits. However, this is still likely to be a superior situation to the worker, since his risk of no income during this period is eliminated; if there is no suitable employment, he will receive unemployment insurance benefits.

In order to determine the possible impact on the cost of extending unemployment insurance protection to agricultural workers if migratory workers reduced their migration, the cost of the program was estimated under the alternative assumptions that they reduced their interstate employment by 50 to 100 per cent.[17] The workers were assumed to remain in their home state during the periods when they had previously reported they were employed. The assumptions are, indeed, artificial, but they do permit estimates on the cost of the program under extreme conditions; this places an upper bound on the cost with respect to the relaxation of the original assumption of no change in migration after the program.

The analysis included 14 states of the 15 state region participating in the study discussed in the present report.[18] There were 13,443 interstate migratory workers interviewed in Florida. They represented 27 per cent of all migratory workers in the 14 state region. However, when the workers from all 14 states were assigned to a particular state on the basis of the state in which they had the most weeks of work, 23,729, or 47 per cent of the migratory workers of the 14 state region, were assigned to Florida. This result was to be expected, since Florida is generally considered to be a supply state for the Eastern Seaboard Migratory Stream.

It is important to note that migratory workers demonstrate a significant attachment to the labor force; 96 per cent of the

[17]Several restrictions are placed on the reduction procedure in order to be compatible with the operation of the unemployment insurance program. For example, only those workers who met the monetary eligibility requirements were adjusted. In addition, only complete jobs could be deleted to simulate reductions in migration. Deleting part of a job would imply the worker had quit his job and would thus be ineligible for benefits. See [3, 4] for a more complete discussion of the reduction procedure and restrictions imposed.

[18]The states included were Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, and West Virginia.

Florida migratory worker population meet the monetary eligibility requirements for the unemployment insurance program.[19] The study also indicated that 36 per cent of the Florida migratory workers had periods of compensable unemployment, in addition to meeting the monetary eligibility requirements, and thus would have been actual beneficiaries had the program been in effect during the analysis period.

As a result of the compatibility restrictions placed on the reduction procedure, neither the 50 per cent nor 100 per cent reduction in interstate man-weeks was attained. The effective reductions for Florida migratory workers were 23 per cent and 84 per cent. The 100 per cent reduction was more closely attained than the 50 per cent reduction, as a result of the relatively few jobs migratory workers had: 50 per cent had only two different jobs during the 52 week period. As a result, many workers were not given reductions in the 50 per cent case: eliminating half of their second job would imply they were quitting.

The effect of the reductions on the cost of extending unemployment insurance to agriculture is shown in Table 27. Actual benefits increase by 40 per cent, and taxable agricultural earnings decrease by 0.2 per cent under the 50 per cent reduction. With the 100 per cent reduction, actual benefits increase by 183 per cent and taxable agricultural earnings decrease by 1.6 per cent. As a result, the cost rate increases from 3.06 per cent to 4.61 per cent and 8.80 per cent for the 50 and 100 per cent reductions, respectively.[20]

As noted above, such computations place an upper bound on the cost rate as a result of possible changes in migration, but they do not indicate what the rate would be under such a program. This would depend on the magnitude of the reduction in migration as determined by the workers' choices. In order to obtain some understanding of the choice which they might face, the earnings foregone as a result of the reductions have been compared to the increased weeks without work. (Table 28).

The workers who were given reductions reported an average of 48 weeks of employment. Those who were given employment reductions in the 50 per cent case had an average of 11

[19]This and succeeding results are based on the employer coverage criterion of one or more workers in 20 or more weeks or a high quarterly payroll of at least $1500.

[20]Since so many of the migratory workers reported Florida work and were given Florida as a home state, Florida's estimated cost rate increased more than the average of the 14 states. The latter increased from 2.95 per cent to 3.79 and 6.15 per cent, respectively.

Table 27.—Reduced migration and the added cost of unemployment insurance, Florida.†

Item	No reduction	50 per cent reduction	100 per cent reduction
Actual beneficiaries††	16,130 (28.5)	18,810 (33.2)	22,784 (40.2)
Additional potential benefits†††	52.01 (100.0)	52.63 (101.2)	53.81 (103.5)
Additional actual benefits†††	5.74 (100.0)	8.64 (150.5)	16.25 (283.1)
Taxable agricultural earnings†††	187.71 (100.0)	187.43 (99.8)	184.70 (98.4)
Added cost rate††††	3.06	4.61	8.80

†Employer coverage criterion of one or more workers in 20 or more weeks or a high quarterly payroll of at least $1500. The items in this table include only those workers who had agricultural employment during the 52 week period. All monetary items include earnings and benefits allocated to Florida from any of the 14 states.

Numbers in parentheses are percentages.

††The base is 56,624 workers.

†††Million dollars.

††††Additional actual benefits ÷ taxable agricultural earnings × 100.

weeks deleted, representing 22 per cent of their weeks of employment. Their resultant loss in income was an average of $489 or 12 per cent of the average income of migratory workers in the study.[21] Those given reductions in the 100 per cent case were given average reductions of 16 weeks, representing 33 per cent of their employment weeks. Similarly, their resultant income reduction was $878 or 22 per cent. The question at this point is how the worker will behave given these options. For example, will he choose to give up 12 per cent of his income for 11 additional weeks without work or 22 per cent of his income for 16 additional weeks without work, or any other similar combination? These are only two of the possible combinations, of course, but they do indicate the losses which the individual would face were he to reduce his migration and collect unemployment insurance benefits during periods when he was previously employed. Given the average income of $3,908, the foregone earnings appear to be relatively large for an individual

[21]Included in income are earnings and unemployment insurance benefits which they would receive under the program.

Table 28.—Work reduction and income loss per person, Florida.†

Item	Work reduction	
	50 per cent	100 per cent
Persons with work reductions	4,470	11,219
Average weeks of employment prior to reduction	47.6	48.2
Reduction per person (weeks)	10.6	15.7
Reduction per person (per cent)	22.3	32.6
Net loss in income per person ($)††	489	878
Net loss in income as per cent of income per person†††	12.5	22.5

†Coverage provision of one or more workers in 20 or more weeks or a high quarterly payroll of at least $1500.

††Income is defined to include earnings plus actual benefits.

†††Average earnings, average actual benefits, and average income for migrants were $3,812, $96, and $3,908, respectively.

to remain unemployed when his past experience indicates that he can obtain employment.

Reduced migration would also have an effect on the amount of labor available for agriculture during peak seasonal demands. However, since Florida is a supply state, the reduced migration assumed in the study would have relatively little effect on the supply of labor to agriculture in Florida. The estimated reduction in total man-weeks of agricultural labor was 0.18 per cent reduction. The states which would be most effected by the reductions are the short duration demand states such as New Jersey.

The major impact in Florida would be the reservoir of unemployed workers during the off-season. This could affect the character of local communities which had large numbers of such workers. Possibly more local government services such as health, education, and welfare would be utilized if the migrants were to become year-around residents of local communities.[22] However, such effects are directly dependent on the number of workers who actually reduce their migration.

[22]These effects are considered in more detail in [1, Ch. 5].

Impact of Extending Agricultural Coverage Upon the Present Florida U.I. System

Extension of unemployment insurance to cover agriculture will increase the administrative burden of providing services to covered employers and their workers. Assuming that the present Florida coverage of 1 in 20 or $1500 high quarterly payroll were adopted for agriculture, approximately 5,100 employers would be added to the system, now totaling 67,193 nonagricultural employers. Since the cost rate for providing U.I. protection for agricultural workers is over three times the present rate for nonagricultural workers, the inclusion of agriculture into the system would raise the overall Florida cost rate from 0.92 per cent of taxable wages to slightly over one per cent. Benefits paid to Florida agricultural workers are estimated to represent approximately 14 per cent of nonagricultural benefits paid in 1971 (Table 29). And as noted earlier the agricultural cost rate of approximately 3.1 per cent is considerably above the 1.0 per cent rate presently required of newly covered employers in Florida. At least for three years, until experience ratings are established between 0 and 4.5 per cent of taxable payrolls for newly covered agricultural employers, the nonagricultural sector would be subsidizing benefits to agricultural workers.

Table 29.—Comparison of agricultural and present nonagricultural coverage in Florida, assuming 1 in 20 or $1500 employer coverage provision.

Item	Present (1971) nonagricultural coverage	Agricultural coverage	Agricultural coverage as a per cent of nonagricultural coverage
Covered employers	67,193	5,116	7.61
Covered taxable payroll	$5,377 mil.	$224.2 mil.	4.17
Benefits paid	$49.4 mil.	$6.9 mil.†	13.99
Benefits paid as a percentage of taxable payroll	0.92	3.09	335.87

†This item is estimated by applying the added cost rate obtained from the workers survey analysis (100 × additional actual benefits ÷ taxable agricultural wages) to the covered taxable payroll as estimated from the employer survey. Since the covered taxable payroll from the employer survey was considerably larger than covered taxable wages estimated from the worker survey, the estimated benefits are correspondingly larger than those estimated from the worker survey.

Source for nonagricultural data: [5].

Impact Upon Production Costs

Assuming agricultural coverage under the present Florida employer provision of at least one worker employed at least 20 weeks or $1500 quarterly payroll, newly covered employers would be required to pay taxes into the system at the rate of 1.5 per cent of taxable wages, including the 0.5 per cent net federal tax. The actual tax obligation, however, depends upon the payroll situation for each individual agricultural firm. Using average payroll data for the various farm types, it is estimated that the average newly covered vegetable farm employer, for example, would pay approximately $1,300 per year to the U.I. system, while the average newly covered livestock farm employer would be taxed $185. For "experienced" employers who have participated in the U.I. system for at least three years, the minimum tax ranges from $62 per year for the average livestock employer to a maximum tax of $4,676 for the average employer of "other field crops" (Table 30).

Impact Upon Labor Usage

While it is clear that universal U.I. coverage would increase the overall cost of agricultural production, it is not readily apparent to what extent agricultural employers will adjust their operations to minimize the impact of the U.I. tax. It is quite likely, however, that agricultural employers will seek to decrease their use of hired labor, decrease their use of seasonal labor, possibly increase the use of workers who will not easily qualify for U.I. benefits (students), increase the utilization of contract labor, and otherwise conduct personnel activities to minimize the incidence of benefit claims.

Impact Upon Mechanization

An obvious offset to increased production costs brought about by a possible U.I. program is the further adoption of labor-saving technology in Florida agriculture. Since Florida agriculture still contains extensive hand harvest labor requirements for sugarcane, citrus, numerous vegetables, and tobacco, the increased costs of the U.I. program could partially trigger a faster rate of mechanization for these crops. A move in this direction, while reducing the aggregate level of hired laborers, would generally upgrade the skill level and alter the mix of types of workers remaining in agriculture.

Interregional and Foreign Competition

Agricultural producers compete with similar producers in other regions and countries. Moving the problem of foreign competition aside for a moment, a U.I. program for agriculture would have no interregional competitive effects if all agricultural producers in the United States were covered on the same basis. However, if coverage is not complete or if the agricultural coverage provisions differ substantially among the states, then the interregional competitive effects could be real and substantial. Cost differences between regions (owing in part to differences in U.I. program costs) could cause shifts in land use. Intraregional shifts in land use could also occur; for example, if large, multiple enterprise employers are relatively more successful in retaining a year-around work force, this would lower their U.I. cost rate, compared with highly specialized employers of individual specialty crops, who may be taxed at the maximium rate.

For some labor intensive commodities facing strong foreign competition in domestic markets, such as fresh Florida winter tomatoes, a U.I. tax upon employers, however uniform among

Table 30.—Average payroll and estimated unemployment insurance taxes for new and experienced employers, by type of farm, Florida.

Type of farm	Average taxable payroll†	Tax on newly covered employers†† 1.5%	Tax for experienced employers	
			Minimum†† 0.5%	Maximum†† 5.0%
	Dollars			
Cash grain	57,844	868	289	2,892
Tobacco	27,344	410	137	1,367
Other field crops	93,530	1,403	468	4,676
Vegetables	86,198	1,293	431	4,310
Fruit and nut	49,476	742	247	2,474
Poultry	15,409	231	77	770
Dairy	46,595	699	233	2,330
Livestock	12,332	185	62	617
General	38,576	579	193	1,929
Miscellaneous	37,076	556	185	1,854

†For average employer covered under the 1 in 20 or $1500 provision.
††Includes the 0.5 percent federal administrative tax.

domestic employers, tends to diminish the competitive position of Florida producers in relation to foreign (Mexican) producers. Admittedly, the differential costs caused by the U.I. program would be only one of several causes of a possible decline in Florida's competitive position in the fresh winter tomato market.

Impact on Worker Compensation

A final consideration to note is that agricultural workers may benefit from the extension of unemployment insurance to agriculture in addition to receiving income during periods of compensable unemployment. Some of the risk of unemployment is transferred from the worker to the employer under an unemployment insurance system. In essence, the employer is purchasing an insurance policy to insure against possible lay-offs in the future. As a result, workers may be willing to accept a lower wage from a covered employer than they would otherwise accept. Thus, the increased cost to the employer due to the tax may be offset somewhat by a wage rate lower than it might be without the unemployment insurance program. Similarly, the covered employer would be expected to have a comparative advantage over the noncovered employer in attracting workers.

GLOSSARY

ACTUAL BENEFICIARY—Any person satisfying the monetary unemployment insurance eligibility requirements and having weeks of compensable unemployment.

ACTUAL BENEFITS—The benefit amount which an individual could have withdrawn based on his earnings, employment, and his weeks of compensable unemployment, assuming an unemployment insurance program in force during the survey year.

ADDED COST RATE—The ratio of additional actual benefits resulting from agricultural coverage to taxable agricultural earnings, multiplied by 100.

ANALYSIS YEAR—July 1969 through June 1970.

BENEFIT COST RATE—Actual benefits allocated to agricultural employment divided by taxable agricultural earnings, multiplied by 100.

COMPENSABLE UNEMPLOYMENT—All nonwork categories except in school, sick or injured, and paid vacation.

COVERED EMPLOYER—Employer meeting at least the minimum combination of payroll and number of workers within particular time periods to be included in the program.

ENTITLEMENT—The benefit amount which an individual could withdraw from the fund, based on his employment history if he had a sufficient number of weeks of compensable unemployment in which to claim benefits.

EXPERIENCE RATING—The tax rate applied in practice to a particular employer, based upon his employment experience in addition to the state of the unemployment insurance fund.

FULL COVERAGE—The assumption that every employer is covered under the unemployment insurance program.

LABOR FORCE PARTICIPANT—Any person working with or without wages, self-employed, looking for work, traveling to a new job, wanting work although not working, or not working as a result of bad weather in any given week.

MIGRATORY WORKER—Any person reporting employment in two or more states during the analysis year, unless otherwise stated.

POTENTIAL BENEFICIARY—Any person satisfying the monetary unemployment insurance benefit eligibility requirements.

SEASONAL WAGE ITEM—Employment of a worker by a given employer for less than 150 days.

TAXABLE PAYROLL—The first $4200 paid each worker by a given employer.

WAGE ITEM—Employment of a worker by a given employer for any period of time.

REFERENCES

[1] Bauder, W. W., J. G. Elterich, J. S. Holt, and S. K. Seaver. *Economic and Social Considerations in Extending Unemployment Insurance to Agricultural Workers.* Regional Report II. Regional Research Project NE-58, Submitted to the U.S. Department of Labor, September 30, 1973.

[2] Brownlee, K. A. *Statistical Theory and Methodology in Science and Engineering.* 2nd ed., New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1965.

[3] Emerson, Robert D. *Migration and the Cost of Unemployment Insurance Protection for Agricultural Workers.* Fla. Agr. Exp. Sta. Bull. 760. October 1973.

[4] Emerson, Robert D. *Migration and the Cost of Unemployment Insurance Protection for Agricultural Workers in Florida.* Interim Report. Gainesville: Food and Resource Economics, University of Florida, July 1972.

[5] Florida Department of Commerce. *1971 Annual Report.* Tallahassee, 1972.

[6] Moses, Galen C., and Leo Polopolus. *The Impact of Extending Unemployment Insurance to Agricultural Workers in Florida.* Gainesville: Food and Resource Economics, University of Florida, September 1972.

[7] Spurlock, A. H. *Index Numbers of Agricultural Production in Florida, 1924-1968.* Ag. Econ. Mimeo EC 70-1. Gainesville: University of Florida, July 1969.

[8] U.S. Department of Agriculture. Economic Research Service. *Farm Income Situation.* Washington, D.C., various issues.

[9] U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service. *The Hired Farm Working Force of 1970: A Statistical Report.* Agricultural Economic Report No. 201 (by Robert C. McElroy). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, March 1971.

[10] U.S. Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census. *Census of Population: 1970. General, Social and Economic Characteristics, Final Report.* PC(1)-C11 Florida. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972

[11] U.S. Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census. *1969 Census of Agriculture, Part 29: Florida.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, June 1972.